



Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address: TOMBALL REGIONAL HOSPITAL PO BOX 889 TOMBALL TX 77377	MFDR Tracking #: M4-06-4848-01
	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #: NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE CO Box #: 19	Date of Injury:
	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Requestor's Position Summary: "The Department of Workers' Compensation, then the Commission, contracted with Ingenix, Inc., in 2002 to develop MARs for a hospital outpatient fee guideline. Ingenix recommended to the Commission that a market reimbursement of 140% of Medicare's Outpatient Prospective Payment System (HOPPS) would meet the statutory requirements of Section 413.011(d)." "The 2005 HOPPS median payment for CPT code 29881 is \$1,674.44 multiplied by 140% equals \$2,344.21. Hartford has paid \$1,118.00. Please reprocess this claim and issue an additional payment to Tomball Regional Hospital in the amount of \$1,226.21."

Principal Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Medical Bill(s)
3. EOB(s)
4. Medical Records
5. Total Amount Sought - \$1226.21

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Respondent's Position Summary: "pd fair & reasonable."

Principal Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
9/14/2005	W10, W1	Outpatient Surgery	\$1,226.21	\$0.00
			Total Due:	\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on March 27, 2006. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on April 3, 2006 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
 - W10-No maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reduced to fair and reasonable.
 - (850-068)-The recommended payment reflects a fair, reasonable and consistent methodology for reimbursement pursuant to the criteria set forth in Section 413.011(D).
 - W1-WC state fee schedule adjustment. Reimbursement for your resubmitted invoice has been considered. No additional monies are being paid at this time.
2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that "reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011"...
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires that the request shall include "a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier for reconsideration in accordance with §133.304." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not submitted a copy of the original bill. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form, format, and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A).
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(C), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires that the request shall include "a table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form, format and manner prescribed by the commission". Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has indicated that the amount billed for the services in dispute is the total for all services charged on the hospital bill; however the documentation does not support that all of the services in dispute were rendered on the date of service listed on the requestor's *Table of Disputed Services*. The requestor listed the disputed date of service as 9/14/05 on the *Table*; the total charges on the bill were for date of service 9/12/05 and 9/14/05. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form, format, and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(C).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include: (i) a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute, (ii) the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid or refunded, (iii) how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues, and (iv) how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not discuss or explain how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues, or how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that requestor has not provided documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C).
7. Division Rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §133.1 of this title (relating to Definitions) and §134.1 of this title (relating to Use of the Fee Guidelines)"... Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's position statement states that "The Department of Workers' Compensation, then the Commission, contracted with Ingenix, Inc., in 2002 to develop MARs for a hospital outpatient fee guideline. Ingenix recommended to the Commission that a market reimbursement of 140% of Medicare's Outpatient Prospective Payment System (HOPPS) would meet the statutory requirements of Section 413.011(d)." "The 2005 HOPPS median payment for CPT code 29881 is \$1,674.44 multiplied by 140% equals \$2,344.21. Hartford has paid \$1,118.00. Please reprocess this claim and issue an additional payment to Tomball Regional Hospital in the amount of \$1,226.21."
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how additional payment of \$1,226.21 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
 - The requestor did not submit a copy of the Ingenix report for review to support the proposed methodology.
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and

reasonable rate of reimbursement.

- The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would ensure the quality of medical care, achieve effective medical cost control, provide for payment that is not in excess of a fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, consider the increased security of payment, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) or Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
- The requestor did not discuss or support that the proposed methodology would ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

8. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(A), §133.307(e)(2)(C), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304, §133.307, §134.1
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

March 16, 2010

Authorized Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

Date

PART VIII: : YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division Rule 148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code Section 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code Section 413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.